

REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

In response to the Office Action dated August 29, 2006, claims 1, 6, 7 and 12 are amended. Claims 1-20 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

I. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Fig. 25 and page 1 line 10 to page 5, line 9 of the specification (hereinafter AAPA). The reasons for rejecting claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16 are those of record.

The rejections of claims 17-20 are respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner advises that he “interprets that since the AAPA discloses the same structure which is claimed in claims 1, 6, 7 and 12 that the structure of the AAPA would do the same thing as the claimed structure, meaning that there would be substantially no difference in signal delay” (see top of page 7 of the Office Action). However, contrary to such interpretation, the present application describes (page 4, lines 9-11) a problem in the prior art twin-panel display resulting from delays of source signals on some source bus lines and page 5, lines 2-9 describes this delay as resulting from the difference in capacitance. In view of such disclosure regarding the AAPA, it is incorrect for the Examiner to disregard this disclosure and maintain that the AAPA discloses or suggests:

an amount of the first capacitance is such that there is substantially no difference in signal delay on each first bus line of the active matrix substrate that is connected to a first bus line on the other active matrix substrate and signal delay on the at least one first bus line with a first capacitance.

Thus, claims 17-20 are patentable over AAPA.

II. Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Kurashima et al. (USPN 6,954,184), for the reasons of record.

III. To expedite prosecution, independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

the first capacitance is formed by arranging (i) a first bus line not connected to first bus lines on another active matrix substrate and (ii) a line other than the second bus lines to cross each other.

Independent claim 7 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

the first capacitance is formed by arranging (i) a first bus line that is on an active matrix substrate and that is not shared for use with another active matrix substrate and (ii) a line other than the second bus lines to cross each other.

Finally, independent claim 12 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*:

the first capacitance is formed by arranging (i) a first bus line not connected to the pixel electrodes and (ii) a line other than the second bus lines to cross each other.

The above limitation: ***the first capacitance is formed by arranging (i) a first bus line and (ii) a line other than the second bus lines to cross each other*** is supported, for example, by descriptions at page 19, lines 17-21 and page 22, line 24 to page 23, line 3 of the present specification.

The first capacitance having such a feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by AAPA. In addition, via the above amendments to claims 1, 6, 7 and 12, it is clear that the first capacitance is formed intentionally and therefore, is different from AAPA.

In view of the above, the allowance of claims 1-20, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the amendment and favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise (Reg. No. 34,523) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Charles Gorenstein
Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant